



IPC GUIDANCE NOTE

Gender-sensitive IPC Food Security analysis

January 2024

WHAT DOES THE IPC TECHNICAL MANUAL V3.1 SAY ABOUT THE TOPIC?

- IPC Technical Manual asks analysts to highlight possible gender inequalities in terms of food security status and specifies that household analysis groups for IPC analysis can be defined based on gender. Refer to pages 52 and 54 in Manual 3.1 for details.

WHAT DOES THIS RESOURCE ADD TO THE MANUAL?

- This document provides guidance for conducting gender-sensitive IPC analysis.

SECTION USE

This guidance provides information to IPC analysts on conducting gender-sensitive IPC Acute Food Insecurity analyses. More specifically, the guidance is divided into two sections: the first section addresses the rationale and parameters for gender-sensitive analysis, whereas the second section focuses on practical guidance for conducting gender-sensitive analysis. In addition, the guidance note provides suggestions for collection of gender-sensitive indicators. Case studies on gender-sensitive analyses have been included in the annex. The guidance is expected to be used by IPC facilitators and analysts in countries where gender-sensitive analysis is conducted prior to the release of new, more extensive guidance and protocols for disaggregated analysis.

SECTION CONTENTS

Introduction

Section 1: Parameters for gender-sensitive IPC analysis

Section 2: Process for conducting gender-sensitive IPC analysis

Further indicators and information sources

Annexes

1. Experiences and examples from gender-sensitive analyses
2. Challenges of gender-sensitive analyses
3. Resource materials on gender aspects

CONTACTS

For queries or to request for support contact the IPC Global Support Unit at info@ipcinfo.org.

Introduction

IPC analyses are conducted to provide information to decision-makers on food and nutrition security of the population living in certain areas where food insecurity and malnutrition is potentially most heightened. Even though IPC Acute and Chronic Analyses typically focus on classification of entire populations, it is acknowledged that different population groups may be at greater risk of food insecurity and malnutrition than others. These include groups that are marginalised in the society or who by the condition of e.g. their social or health status are prevented from having safe and equal access to resources and services. These groups may include for example persons with disability, elders, widows, women or women-headed households, or households with particularly vulnerable member(s). Research conducted by CARE shows a link between gender inequality and food insecurity.¹ In aggregate terms, the higher the gender inequality in a given country, the more food insecure the country is likely to be. Moreover, since 2018, the State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World report (SOFI²) includes estimates of access to food disaggregated by gender at global and regional level, pointing to higher levels of food insecurity among women compared to men in every region of the world.

The IPC Food Security Analytical Framework includes a specific reference to 'gender and other socio-economic inequalities and discrimination' under causal factors of food insecurity. Until now, however, these aspects are rarely examined in IPC analyses in detail, in part because most indicators commonly used to assess food security are collected at the household level without analysis of the impact of sex, either at head of household level or at inter-household level. Household level indicators and analysis mask differences within households: for example, food consumption patterns at household level reveal little about food consumption of individual household members, whereas household ownership of assets does not specify whether household members have equitable access to those resources. To get a more comprehensive understanding of food insecurity, it is necessary to also examine the situation of the most vulnerable members of the households with data collected on individuals within the household.

Decision-makers are increasingly interested in receiving more specific information on the food security status of specific groups to improve response planning, inform advocacy and budgeting to ensure assistance is targeted to the most vulnerable populations. Furthermore, there has been a growing need for the IPC to take gender aspects into more substantial consideration in the analyses, and to provide more detailed information on differences in food security status by gender. Whereas parts of the guidance below are applicable to analysis of different vulnerable groups, the main focus of this guidance relates to gender-sensitive analysis. For the purposes of this note, gender-sensitive analysis refers specifically to an IPC analysis that accounts for the potential differential impacts of gender on food security, looking at similarities and differences in the way men, women, girls and boys e.g. access food and income, cope with shocks, and the barriers and risks associated with meeting food needs.

In short, the guidance has been prepared to respond to the need for more detailed and disaggregated IPC analysis, for a more in-depth understanding of the food security situation of vulnerable populations that can more effectively inform targeting, funding and programming.

The guidance provided is based on adaptation of the regular IPC analysis process to gender-sensitive analysis, different experiences from IPC and Cadre Harmonisé gender analyses, information on gender-sensitive indicators, inputs from partner agencies working on strengthening gender integration, and gender and food security literature and guidance released by IPC partners and other institutions. More information on relevant information sources is available in Annex 3.

The guidance note is divided into two main sections, with the first section laying the ground for gender-sensitive analysis by highlighting the relevant concepts and parameters, whereas the second section focuses on guidance for conducting gender-sensitive analysis. Further information is also available on indicators that can be used for IPC analysis with a gender focus. In addition, there are specific thematic inputs and examples to clarify and deepen the overall guidance.

¹ See e.g. <https://careevaluations.org/evaluation/food-security-and-gender-equality/>

² FAO, IFAD, UNICEF, WFP and WHO. 2023. The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World 2023. Urbanization, agrifood systems transformation and healthy diets across the rural–urban continuum. Rome, FAO. <https://doi.org/10.4060/cc3017en>

SECTION 1:

Parameters for Gender-Sensitive IPC Analysis

1.1 GENDER-SENSITIVE ANALYSIS: DEFINING GENDER AND HOUSEHOLD

gender is a social, rather than a physical construct. UN Women defines gender in the following manner: “Gender refers to the social attributes and opportunities associated with being male and female and the relationships between women and men and girls and boys, as well as the relations between women and those between men. These attributes, opportunities and relationships are socially constructed and are learned through socialization processes. They are context/ time-specific and changeable. Gender determines what is expected, allowed and valued in a woman or a man in a given context. In most societies, there are differences and inequalities between women and men in responsibilities assigned, activities undertaken, access to and control over resources, as well as decision-making opportunities. Gender is part of the broader socio-cultural context. Other important criteria for socio-cultural analysis include class, race, poverty level, ethnic group and age.”³

For IPC purposes gender-sensitive analysis most often focuses on assessing the food security status of women vs. men, or alternatively of female and/or male-headed households. For the latter kind of analysis (a type of household analysis group -analysis, i.e. HAG analysis), it is important to clarify the concepts of “household” and how to assess whether the household is headed by a female or a male.

Typically, in food security assessments and analysis a **household consists of individuals who live together and who eat together from the same pot**. This is the definition of a household that is applied also in IPC analyses. There are several definitions for “head of household”. A simple definition stemming from UN guidance is the following: “the head of the household is the person who is acknowledged as such by the other household members”.⁴

However, it is important to keep in mind that the concept of female-headed household is not always clear. For instance, the adult male in the household may not be present (for example due to conscription or migration for improved livelihood opportunities), but still takes the important decisions at a distance. Conversely the adult male in the household may be incapacitated, but due to social norms the household is reported as a male-headed household. As a result, it is advisable to gather more evidence on the situation (e.g. marital status, including widowed, main income source) and demographic composition of the household to support the designation of the household as male- or female-headed. The definition of a household above can also be helpful in identifying and defining female-headed households: if an adult male is not present in the household e.g. due to migration, and/or is not sharing the same food as the rest of the household, the household should be identified as female-headed. Given the context-specific nuances in defining female- and male-headed households, it is important to agree on the definitions in advance of household data collection and pay attention to the agreed definitions in the training of enumerators.

1.2 TWO TYPES OF GENDER-SENSITIVE IPC FOOD SECURITY ANALYSES

There are two options regarding conducting gender -sensitive IPC analyses: household analysis group -based analysis i.e. analysis of female- (and male-) headed households, or focusing on individuals, i.e. women and girls.

1.2.1 Female- and male-headed households

Given the existing IPC protocols for household group -based analysis, analysis of household groups determined by sex of head of household can be done by applying those protocols. In this case female- and male-headed households are separated into their own groups and analysed, including classification and preparation of population estimates. This type

³ UN Women Concepts and Definitions

⁴ Manual VII - Methods for Projecting Households and Families. Available at: <https://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/publications/pdf/manuals/economy/manual7/chapter1.pdf>

of analysis can be conducted to complement the normal area-based IPC analysis in two ways: the analysis of vulnerable groups should inform the standard area-based analysis, and the analysis can also provide stand-alone information on these groups that can be communicated separately. If time and human resources are limited, and there is a particular interest in female-headed households, those can be analysed on their own as an initial step. However, analysis of both male- and female-headed households is strongly encouraged in order to qualify as a gender analysis, as that allows a more detailed understanding and comparison of the two groups and would be more reflective of gender dynamics within the overall situation.

1.2.2 Analysis of individual household members

In order to capture the differential experiences of vulnerable groups, it would be necessary to conduct analysis at the level of individuals i.e. analysis of the status of women/men and girls/boys within households. Given that IPC acute food insecurity protocols do not include classifications of individuals, it is not possible to produce populations tables with, for example, percentages of men and women in different Phases. An exception for the analysis of individuals or groups of individuals is made with the IPC Acute Malnutrition Analysis, where the primary focus is on analysis of nutritional status of children under five.

Despite this limitation, analysis of aspects of the food security situation of individuals will enrich the regular IPC area-based analysis and contribute to improved understanding on vulnerability characteristics of different groups of individuals. As a result, IPC analysts are encouraged to report individual-level sex disaggregated data, and, when possible, intra-household information on the food security situation.

1.3 EVIDENCE AVAILABILITY AND FEASIBILITY OF ANALYSIS

IPC analyses are always based on evidence that is available for a given geographical area or household group that is being analysed. Evidence can be roughly divided into three different types for IPC purposes: direct evidence on outcomes, indirect evidence on outcomes, and evidence on contributing factors.

Direct evidence on IPC acute food insecurity outcomes (food consumption, livelihood change, nutritional status and mortality) constitute all evidence on these that have been included in the IPC Acute Food Insecurity Reference Table. Indirect evidence on outcomes is evidence that informs on the different outcomes but is not included in the IPC Reference Tables. Finally, evidence on contributing factors would include any data point available on topics such as food security dimensions, vulnerability characteristics (including safety and protection conditions), or shocks. All three types of evidence can and should be used for IPC analysis, including classification and population estimates. The sections below explain in more detail the types and kinds of data typically available for gender-sensitive analysis.

1.3.1 Analysis by sex of household head

Even though IPC AFI protocols allow the classification of the expected most vulnerable household group that reaches at least 20% of the total population to determine the food security phase of an area, it is generally recommended to assess the food security situation of the entire population to provide more information for decision-making.

This means that analysis is recommended to be conducted for specific household groups that altogether add up to 100% of the total population. This allows analysis and comparison of e.g. male- and female-headed households. If desired, and data exists, other household groups can also be added, such as households who are headed by or have a member that is chronically ill/disabled, elderly vs. other households. This analysis can be conducted with existing IPC protocols and information that is often available in household surveys. It should be noted, however, that whereas analysis of female-headed households provides information on this type of household, the findings cannot be extrapolated to women as a population group. The constraints faced by and the opportunities available to women in general and female-headed households in particular are likely to be rather different, reducing applicability of analysis of female-headed households to the overall female population. Furthermore, another large limitation is the fact that female-headed households form a minority of all women in each population.

It must also be remembered that to classify household groups, the number of households in each group per analysis area must be at least 90, derived from at least 5 clusters.⁵ This rule is derived from the IPC guidance on evidence requirements, which divides evidence into different categories depending on time relevance and soundness of method of evidence. Good soundness of method is reserved for comprehensive sources of evidence, e.g. surveys that have at least 25 clusters per analysis area or those that use systematic sampling with at least 150 cases per analysis area. Limited soundness of method concerns for example surveys that collect observations from at least 90 households and five clusters per analysis area, or remote surveys that reach at least 90 households by area, with mobile phone ownership of 60%. Since the share of households headed by e.g. children or chronically ill is typically very low, it may not be possible to conduct household group –based analysis for these groups except possibly at national level or at most at the first administrative level. The situation is typically likely to be different for female- and male-headed households but may still lead to situations where analysis on these groups, or on one of them, cannot be conducted at the level usually used for IPC analysis. This may also place further limitations to the analysis in terms of lack of nuanced understanding of the livelihood context, as is typical for analyses conducted at a higher administrative level.

In this case, it is recommended to reanalyse the data available to verify at what administrative level the analysis requirements are met. It is possible that if IPC area-based analysis is conducted at administrative level 2, gender-sensitive analysis of household groups can be conducted at administrative level 1. This may be the case for example for most of the administrative level 1 areas, but not all, depending on sampling. Review of data availability prior to the analysis is crucial to determine the options, and to take an informed decision on the type of analysis to be conducted. In certain countries, however, where female heads of households are rare, it may only be possible to conduct this type of disaggregated analysis at national level.

In order to provide data that is truly representative of the target population, it is nevertheless necessary to design the sample based on the need to conduct analysis by certain household groups. This is likely to have large cost implications, multiplying the cost of a given survey due to increased sampling. Normally IPC Technical Working Groups (TWGs) plan data collections to meet the minimum IPC requirements (at least 90 households) for each analysis area. If the IPC TWG decides to conduct analysis on female-headed households, and it is known (e.g. based on census data) that share of female-headed households is approximately 30% of all households, the normal sample size would need to be tripled in order to guarantee sampling enough female-headed households for conducting analysis for same analysis areas. Besides having cost implications, this will also make the data collection more complex to manage, while the increased time needed can cause challenges in terms of seasonality and comparability between areas.

When conducting analysis by household groups, normal household survey data with information on contributing factors (demography, shocks, food and income sources, assets, agricultural activities etc.) as well as direct evidence on food consumption and livelihood change can be disaggregated by gender of head of household.⁶ Ensuing tables and graphs, as well as any supporting information coming from other sources, can be provided to analysts. Analysts will proceed with differentiated analysis for male- and female-headed households at the appropriate administrative level, culminating in classification and estimation of populations as per IPC standards.⁷

⁵ Please see IPC Manual 3.1 Protocol 2.4 on evidence reliability criteria

⁶ Disaggregation of area-based survey data for specific household groups may mean that data is not representative of the group, if data cannot be re-weighted through post-stratification weights (and this is rarely possible). For IPC purposes, however, disaggregated data, when meeting the IPC criteria in terms of sampling, is considered sufficient for differentiated analysis of the household groups.

⁷ If the regular IPC analysis and HAG analysis are conducted at the same level, there is a possibility of arriving at contradictory population estimates (e.g. based on area-based analysis, the share of households in Phase 3+ is 36%, but based on HAG analysis the share is 32%). In order to avoid potential confusion, in these situations it is strongly recommended to conduct analysis only on the primary HAG of interest (rather than on all HAGs adding up to 100% of the total population).

Box 1: Qualitative Data

Qualitative Data

While IPC protocols do not provide specific guidance on collection and use of qualitative data for analysis, this type of data can nevertheless be especially valuable for gender-sensitive and disaggregated analysis. Qualitative data can provide better contextual understanding of constraints faced by different vulnerable groups, even if on its own qualitative data cannot be used to classify or to estimate populations. It can reveal unforeseen aspects and data gaps, shed light on quantitative findings, and help build a cohesive narrative of the food security situation and lived experiences of populations of interest. Given that qualitative data collection may touch on sensitive, lived experiences, it is important to follow the do-no-harm -principles in enumerator training, planning of surveys, and during data collection.

Qualitative data collection methods include, among others, focus groups and semi-structured interviews (open-ended questions) with key informants or with respondents (e.g. household members) who are purposefully selected based on characteristics considered to be relevant for the study. These can include sex, age, marital status, number and age of children, livelihood, ethnic group, neighborhood, access to resources, social networks, etc. Data analysis is inductive and may lead to the identification of additional relevant characteristics and the need for more interviews.

There are no specific criteria for assessing the soundness of method or time relevance of qualitative data in IPC protocols. However, the generic guidance included in the IPC Reliability Score Table in IPC Manual 3.1. applies also to qualitative data. The generic guidance emphasizes the use of data collection methods that are internationally recognized as good practices, and the need for the data to reflect current conditions.

1.3.2 Analysis of individuals

Given that as per IPC protocols individuals are not classified in IPC Acute Food Insecurity analysis, any data on women or men as individuals need to be included in a standard area-based or household group IPC analysis, together with any other data on the area itself or households living in the area. To incorporate any data and analysis on individuals into the area-based analysis, analysts need to have access to gender-specific information and have good analysis skills in weaving the analysis findings and overall narrative for gendered analysis into the normal area-based analysis.

There are only a few globally recognized food security indicators that collect data on individuals instead of households. One such indicator is Minimum Dietary Diversity of Women (MDD-W). Another largely comparable indicator with the same cut-off and recall period is Individual Dietary Diversity Score (IDDS), whereas Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES) data can be collected with reference to either individuals or households (albeit is more commonly collected on households in surveys informing IPC analyses). These indicators provide indirect evidence on the food consumption outcome, as the IPC Acute Food Insecurity Reference Table does not include thresholds for any indicators collected at the individual level (whereas the IPC Chronic Food Insecurity Reference Table does contain thresholds for MDD-W). Most other typically used food consumption indicators, also those included in the IPC AFI Reference Table, are collected only on households rather than on individuals. If information collected through the indicators mentioned above (or other similar indicators) exists, it can be helpful in understanding aspects of the food security situation of these groups of individuals. Each has its own severity cut-off or cut-offs that can be used for IPC analysis and reporting purposes as indirect evidence.

Seasonal household surveys can also include further gender-specific questions, especially if there is an agreement with agencies collecting data to insert relevant gender-sensitive indicators. Besides the indicators mentioned above, useful indicators collected concern the livelihood activities and share of income generated by men and women out of total household income. Questions can also focus e.g. on differentiated roles in terms of agricultural activities and animal ownership.

Furthermore, indicators on wasting are collected on individuals rather than on households. As a result, it is possible to report separately on nutritional status of boys and girls under 5 in IPC Acute Malnutrition analysis reports. In addition, Body Mass Index (BMI) is often collected on women of reproductive age but can be collected on any group of adults and reported accordingly. The cut-off of 18.5 is used to identify adults who are underweight.

Box 2: Gender Inequalities and Food Insecurity⁸

Gender-based violence and food security

In 2021, FAO, IFAD, UNICEF, WFP and WHO, reported that the prevalence of moderate to severe food insecurity was 10% higher among women than men in 2020 and the food insecurity gender gap widened from 2019 to 2020. The findings were based on FIES data collected on individuals.

Food insecurity is not only affecting women disproportionately, but evidence shows a range of gendered impacts, including direct links to gender-based violence (GBV). Food insecurity exacerbates already existing GBV risks and creates new ones for women and girls. In the Sahel region of West Africa for instance, food insecurity, due to drought and fast rising average temperatures, combined with displacements and widespread insecurities act as “threat multipliers,” increasing levels of intimate partner violence (IPV), sexual violence, sexual harassment, exploitation and abuse, and child marriage, the latter being a negative strategy to reduce the number of mouths to feed in the household.

Trends in CAR observed in reported GBV incidents over the last 2 years show an increase in reports of intimate partner violence (IPV) during the lean season, drought periods and in areas where food insecurity is higher. Similarly in Uganda, after adjusting for a number of variables such as age group, religion, number of lifetime sexual partners, etc., researchers found a persistent correlation between food insecurity and physical and sexual violence against women. Furthermore, it is important to recognize that within the household in particular, the relationship between gender inequality, and food insecurity is further exacerbated thus creating increased household tensions and risks of GBV and IPV. The correlation is bi-directional, in that food insecurity not only accelerates IPV risk, but the existence of IPV risk can accelerate food insecurity. In Bangladesh and India, women reported that they ate less (and often last) to avoid IPV.

In Somalia currently 3 million people have been displaced of which 82% are women and children. Incident reports from the GBVIMS between January and May 2022 show a 60% increase of reported cases of IPV and a 20% increase in women and girls accessing lifesaving GBV response services due to sexual violence and intimate partner violence in drought impacted communities.

Overall analysis or understanding of how women and girls may be disproportionately affected by food insecurity (as both an outcome and a driver of GBV) within individual households should be captured in gender-sensitive IPC analysis as these individual level dynamics are critical in any understanding of the risks and impacts on food insecurity for women and girls, and how these risks reflect and are exacerbated by GBV.

While incorporating information of GBV and its links to food insecurity is useful for in-depth analysis, it should also be acknowledged that it may be difficult to establish a clear association or especially a causal relationship between the two in a particular context or for a specific group of households, especially in absence of detailed evidence. Partner reports monitoring e.g. levels of GBV incidents may, however, shed light on these questions and provide valuable information for any gender-specific IPC analysis.

⁸ Text on GBV and food insecurity provided by UNFPA. Given extensive sensitivities relating to collection of data on GBV, it is recommended to do so only with appropriate training, expertise, and knowledge of referral opportunities in place.

SECTION 2:

Process for Conducting Gender-Sensitive IPC Analysis

This section explains the process for conducting gender-sensitive IPC analysis, including specific subsections for the two different types of gender-sensitive analysis where applicable.

2.1. ANALYSIS PROCESS

The process for conducting gender-sensitive IPC analysis includes several steps, which are outlined below. These steps should be followed in a sequential manner.

1. Engaging with decision-makers to understand what analysis products are most critical to inform the response and how the products will be used.

As a starting point the IPC TWG (Technical Working Group) in a country should consult decision-makers from different agencies and institutions to find out if and what type of gender-specific analysis produced by the IPC would be useful for informing resource allocations for food security programmes. Decision-makers, e.g. heads of programme divisions of partner agencies, and Government and donor representatives are best placed to inform the TWG on their needs for information, and if they would benefit more from analysis of groups of individuals or analysis of household groups. The responses of decision-makers, combined with best practices around inclusive programming, can subsequently guide decisions on data collection, analysis preparation, training of analysts, and focus of the eventual gender-sensitive analysis.

These consultations should take place within the regular interactions of the TWG members, including the TWG Chair, with decision-makers at national level on IPC process and use of IPC findings. The process for interaction depends on the country context and can range from informal exchanges of TWG members with decision-makers in their organisations to formal meetings of the IPC Steering Committee (in countries where this is in place). Regular communication with decision-makers is important also to understand how gender-sensitive IPC products ultimately inform advocacy and programming after their publication.

2. Assessing data availability

The next step is assessment of the availability of gender-specific information and gender disaggregated data. There may be IPC partners or other agencies in the country who have gender projects, or who collect and release gender-specific and disaggregated data. If the need to conduct gender-sensitive analysis has been identified well ahead of the IPC analysis workshop, there is typically also an opportunity to review data collection plans and to include gender-sensitive indicators and/or to revise sampling to accommodate needs for analysis of specific household groups.

Another useful aspect to verify is the presence of historical data, especially in relatively stable contexts. For example, if the TWG wants to conduct analysis on female- and male-headed households, historical datasets can offer insights into typical share of female-headed households present in the sample, which in turn can guide further data collection efforts and analysis plans. Historical and trend data can also offer insights into patterns e.g. in displacement, women's participation in labour market, asset ownership or dietary consumption.

An important, and typically overlooked, aspect is the policy and legal framework in the country. For example, to better understand the different roles of women and men, it is useful to know if there are differences in the policy and legal environment (customary and common law), or in cultural practices, for example when it comes to rights to inheritance, ownership of assets (such as land titles or livestock) or decision-making power of men and women. When these differences are present, information on them should be made available to the analysts.

3. Taking decision on scope and type of analysis

Based on data availability and decision-makers' needs, analysts need to decide what type of analysis they will conduct: household group -based analysis, and/or analysis informing on the status of individuals alongside the standard area-based analysis. As the sections above, and examples from gender-sensitive analysis below and in the annex show, analysts can choose from different options, or use a mix of approaches, depending on what best suits the context and needs.

Several factors need to be considered when taking a decision on the scope and type of analysis.

- **Time available:**

- o Household group -based analysis: conducting separate household group-based analysis for several areas is likely to add an extra day to the analysis workshop, especially if projection analysis is also conducted. If analysis is only done at national level no extra time is likely to be needed. Further, given potential limitations relating to data availability, it is also possible to split the analysis team so that while some members conduct gender-sensitive HAG analysis for their admin 2/admin 1 area(s), other team members work for example on finalisation of the regular area-based analysis or key messages for communication.
- o Analysis of groups of individuals: adding gender-sensitive evidence to the area-based analysis and conducting gender-sensitive analysis on groups of individuals alongside area-based analysis is likely to have limited time implications (most likely 1-2 hours per analysis area). Time taken for this type of analysis is less, given that analysts do not have to follow the entire analysis process separately, as is the case with HAG-based analysis.

- **Data availability:**

- o As explained above, gender-sensitive HAG analysis requires data on at least 90 households from 5 clusters per HAG, per desired unit of analysis when data on household surveys is used for the analysis.⁹ Often these requirements cannot be met at the normal administrative level of IPC analysis, and in these cases, analysis can be conducted at a higher administrative level by pooling the relevant data.
- o Assessment conducted on groups of individuals (typically women) requires evidence on these individuals, for example on food consumption or food and income sources.
- Presence of qualified analysts and facilitators: In order to conduct gender-sensitive analysis, the IPC partners in a country should either have gender expertise they can mobilise to assist with the training of analysts and analysis itself, or they should be able to request for such support from the outside.
- Needs of decision-makers: based on the consultations conducted with decision-makers, the needs of programming and targeting should also guide the decisions on the scope and type of analysis.

If the TWG opts to conduct household group -based analysis, they will still need to decide on whether to do separate analysis on both men- and female-headed households or on only one group, typically female-headed households. The situation in terms of the factors listed above should help in making the decision.

4. Forming an analysis team

Once the country IPC TWG decides to conduct gender-sensitive analysis, and they have defined the scope and type of analysis to be conducted, it is necessary to review the composition of the analysis team and to include local gender experts/focal points from different agencies in the analysis. If there are organizations focusing on women in the country, representatives of those should be included in the analysis team to the extent possible. Even if there are not so many gender experts in the analysis team, a presence of a few is already beneficial in order to enable support for training and facilitation of gender-sensitive analysis.

⁹ Please refer to IPC Manual for guidance on evidence requirements for other types of evidence than household surveys.

The analysis team should be trained in IPC gender analysis, either as part of the IPC Level 1 training, or as a refresher training provided before the gender analysis takes place. The training should also include a review of data available for gender-sensitive analysis in the country context, and a more detailed overview of indicators that may not be familiar to analysts from previous analyses. Furthermore, the training should be contextualised, depending on the scope and type of the analysis to be conducted. If time allows, the training can include exercises and e.g. a deeper dive into gender analysis methodologies and approaches. If time is limited, it is advisable to focus on the principles of the selected type of gender-sensitive analysis and a review of the data available. Facilitators will play a key role in guiding the analysts through gender-sensitive IPC analysis, and e.g. in ensuring that the evidence available is incorporated appropriately in the analysis.

5. Analysis process

Convergence of evidence

An important principle underpinning gender-sensitive analysis is the use of multifaceted information. To understand the role that gender plays in food security, analysts should assess a diverse set of information pertaining to gendered food and income sources, shocks and challenges, outcome indicators etc., but also in relation to decision-making power. Shedding light to power dynamics within households helps to understand who eats first (and who eats last), who makes decisions on use of income, how assets are distributed, and how food insecurity differently impacts women and men's wellbeing in terms of health, protection, or livelihoods. As mentioned above, a review of structural issues and policy environment, such as land ownership and inheritance laws, helps in assessing to what extent females or female-headed households have equitable access to different resources impacting their food security. Analysts should strive to build a comprehensive picture of the food security situation from a gendered perspective, following the IPC Analytical Framework and approaching the different food security elements from a gender perspective.

HAG-based gender-sensitive analysis

Typically, the HAG-based analysis is conducted after the regular area-based analysis has been completed. After the regular analysis has been finished, the team turns its attention to the selected HAG(s) and completes the analysis process for that/them. The analysis is conducted by using the analysis tool that is also used for the area-based analysis, by creating a separate entry for the HAG(s) in question at a given administrative level.

The normal area-based analysis typically includes a wealth of data that is also helpful in HAG analysis. For example, information on contributing factors such as prices, agricultural production, remote sensing and shocks is equally useful for HAG analysis. In addition, the HAG analysis makes use of the regular survey evidence that has been disaggregated by the household group.

If both female and/or male-headed households are analysed, the analysis is conducted by comparing the situation of the two groups based on the available evidence both in terms of contributing factors and outcome evidence. Both HAGs are consequently classified, with estimations of populations. If only female-headed households are analysed, comparisons can be made between them and the results of the standard area-based analysis given the absence of analysis for male-headed households.

Box 3: Examples of findings of gender-sensitive HAG analysis

Examples of findings of gender-sensitive HAG analysis

Experiences on gender-specific IPC HAG analysis e.g. in CAR show that female-headed households tend to have fewer assets (e.g. access to land) and their income sources are often related to agriculture and petty trade, whereas male-headed households tend to focus on agriculture and e.g. casual labour. Female-headed households tend to dedicate a higher share of the expenditures to food purchases, which seems to be often related to lower household food production. There are typically no significant differences in the amount and type of shocks faced by the different household groups. Despite the differences in asset levels, there are often rather small differences in the outcome indicators by household groups, and the differences can favor either household group depending on indicator and context.

Analysis of groups of individuals

This type of analysis is conducted alongside the regular area-based analysis, not as an add on as the HAG analysis detailed above. In this case the analysis starts by reviewing data that has been made available on group(s) of individuals (typically women), whether for contributing factors or for outcome elements. Analysts should ensure that the evidence available is incorporated in the relevant parts of the analysis and considered when drawing conclusions on different elements.

When it comes to outcome evidence, the available direct and indirect evidence e.g. on food consumption (dietary diversity or Food Insecurity Experience Scale as indirect evidence) or nutrition (BMI as direct evidence) that have been collected on individuals can also be taken into account as evidence for analysis, including classification and population estimates. When evidence on these exist, the existing cut-offs should be used to inform allocation of populations into different Phases.

Given that groups of individuals cannot be classified separately as per IPC protocols, there are no classifications or population estimates for groups of individuals. Rather, as described above, the existing evidence and analysis is expected to inform the area-based population estimates and classifications.

Box 4: Examples of findings on analysis of groups of individuals

Examples of findings on analysis of groups of individuals

Experiences on analysis of groups of individuals (women) show, for example, that in Haiti a sizeable share of women (11%) had not consumed any food group over the previous day, whereas 12% had consumed only one food group. Household decision-making index in CAR (Bangui) showed that on average women take part in around half of the decisions in the households, whereas in Haiti women were more actively involved and took on average part in more than two thirds of the decisions, which is considered an acceptable rate of participation.

6. Communication

At the end of the analysis, analysts should prepare key messages on the most important pieces of evidence and analysis results for communication purposes. This applies equally to both types of gender-sensitive analysis. Overall, communication of findings depends on the type of analysis conducted. If analysis has been done by household analysis groups that have been analysed and classified, the ensuing population table along with a narrative describing the food security situation of the male- and female-headed households as well the key evidence used can be included in the standard IPC Analysis Brief.

If analysis has incorporated evidence on women/men (or any other population groups) these findings can be communicated e.g. in a specific section in IPC analysis reports, together with references to key pieces of evidence available.

There is no specific mapping protocol for gender-sensitive analysis. This is true also for analysis of male- and female-headed households that are classified. Visualisation of analysis findings can, however, be implemented through use of tables (especially the population table for household-analysis groups) and graphics detailing important evidence.

Further Indicators and Information Sources

An interesting indicator for gender-sensitive analysis is the Household Decision-Making Index, which collects information on the roles of women and men (and others) in decision-making on different key issues. Several individual questions in the module are relevant to food security on their own, e.g. questions on use of income, cultivation and sale of production.

Other indices that can be used include WEAI, Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index, or its abbreviated version A-WEAI. This indicator collects information on farming and livestock production, as well as on access to productive capital. The Women's Empowerment in Livestock Index (WELI), includes detailed questions on livestock ownership, roles in decision-making, access to productive capital, access to financial capital, membership in different groups, physical mobility, and time allocation.

Household Economy Analysis (HEA) can provide information for both analysis by household groups, and for gendered analysis of household members/population groups. The table below provides information on what types of indicators and data are available from different HEA products such as HEA baselines, livelihood profiles, LIAS (Livelihoods Impact Analysis Spreadsheet), and baseline storage spreadsheets. Given that these products are not always provided for standard IPC analyses, they should be requested specifically for gender-sensitive analysis whenever HEA data is available.

Table 1. HEA and Gender for IPC Acute Food Insecurity Analyses¹⁰

What information on gender can HEA analyses contribute to IPC analyses?	Where can analysts find this information?	How can this information be used in IPC analyses?
Baseline:		
Analysis of households headed by women, per wealth group (e.g. poor female headed households). • provides an in-depth understanding of livelihoods strategies of female headed households, according to their wealth group	Baseline storage spreadsheet (BSS), Baseline (livelihoods profile) report	Household Analysis Group (HAG) analysis (for female headed households)
*Seasonal calendar, specifically for women's activities	Baseline (livelihoods profile) report	Context, stability
*Percentage of households headed by women in a livelihood zone	BSS – sheet WB (wealth breakdown), sheet Data	Activation of a HAG analysis (for female-headed households)
Household annual income and food sources that women contribute to • for each source, HEA can provide the contribution percentage *In particular, women's main expenditure items, and female headed households' main expenditure items	BSS – sheet Data	Context
*Disaggregation of assets and production methods by household member (women, men, children)	BSS – sheet WB, sheet Data	Context

¹⁰ Table provided by Save the Children

What information on gender can HEA analyses contribute to IPC analyses?	Where can analysts find this information?	How can this information be used in IPC analyses?
Outcome Analysis:		
Type and level of deficit for female headed households (survival or livelihoods protection deficit)	Livelihoods Impact Analysis Spreadsheet (LIAS) – sheet G (Graphs), sheet S (Seasonality)	Amount and type of deficit to inform the food consumption outcome
*Details on livelihoods deterioration for female headed households, including amount and types of income sources	LIAS – sheet G	Can be used as a contributing factor on the evolution of livelihoods
Percentage of female headed households facing a deficit, by type and level of deficit	LIAS - sheet B and G	Activation of a HAG analysis (for female-headed households) Percentage used for population estimates

**This type of data is not collected in a systematic manner within HEA analyses but can be and is increasingly being done.*

A tool called GE4FS (gender equality for food security) combining the standard FIES of eight questions with ten other questions relating to women's empowerment, has been developed and piloted in the past. The ten questions encompass the areas of decision-making ability, financial self-sufficiency, freedom from violence, reproductive freedom and unpaid labour. The results from 17 countries show a link between food security and gender empowerment: countries where differences in prevalence of food insecurity of women and men were smallest, were also the countries where empowerment of women was highest. A link to reference material on the tool and its results are available in Annex 3.

ANNEX 1:

Experiences and Examples from Gender-Sensitive Analyses

Gender-sensitive IPC AFI and CH analyses have been conducted in several countries, particularly in CH countries. Below are some experiences from gender-sensitive analyses in different contexts:

Graph 1: Gender pilot experiences

IPC gender pilot in CAR in Mar-Apr 2022 was conducted for male- and female-headed households in 12 out of 17 préfectures based on data availability from the seasonal household survey, while the standard area-based IPC analysis was completed for sous-préfectures. Further gender-specific data was available on women in Bangui, and this data was incorporated in the area-based analysis of Bangui neighbourhoods. Communication of results took place through the IPC analysis brief, where a page was dedicated to the pilot results, including aggregate population tables for male- and female-headed households. As per the results, female-headed households were slightly more likely to be food insecure than male-headed and had e.g. somewhat worse food consumption, whereas male-headed households were more likely to engage in negative livelihood coping.

IPC gender pilot in CAR

CH gender pilot in Togo took place in Nov 2022, by incorporating gender-sensitive data in regular area-based analysis. Gender-specific data was available through the seasonal household survey on agricultural activities (cultivated surface, animal ownership), share of females out of household income, dietary diversity, MUAC, and anaemia of women. Results of all outcome indicators for food consumption and livelihood change showed a generally worse situation for female-headed households compared to male-headed households. Whereas agriculture is the predominant source of income for all, women and female-headed households also engaged in other activities, especially petty trade. Women typically owned goats and chicken, whereas men also owned these and in addition almost exclusively any other livestock within households.

IPC gender pilot in Togo

CH gender pilot in Niger took place in Nov 2022. The main data source for the analysis and the gender pilot was the regular seasonal assessment. The results were disaggregated by sex of head of household and used to inform the normal area-based analysis. In addition, evidence specific to women and other individuals within households, such as migration and anaemia, were used to enrich the analysis. For example, MDD-W varied by area with between 25 and 40% of women meeting minimum dietary diversity, whereas the share of women with anaemia was typically between 45 and 55% by area. The pilot was also informed by an earlier gender-sensitive HEA analysis done in Niger, showing that women's share of agricultural activities is 30-40% and of animal ownership 70%, whereas more than 25% of revenue of women comes from petty trade.

IPC gender pilot in Niger

ANNEX 2:

Challenges of Gender-Sensitive Analyses

The challenges listed below have been identified through the IPC AFI and CH experiences so far on gender-sensitive analyses. It is expected that efforts underway, including development of better guidance and training materials for gender-sensitive analyses, and gathering of more experiences of gender-sensitive analyses, will at least partially help in resolving the challenges identified.

A common challenge for gender-sensitive analyses is lack of standardised data. In case of analysis of male- and female-headed households, use of household survey results is dependent on meeting minimum sampling requirements for these groups which is often a rather large limitation. Regarding analysis of individuals, there are few standard indicators to use, and use of these for acute food insecurity analysis is hampered by lack of standardised severity cut-offs. For example, only one cut-off (5) exists for MDD-W and IDDS, as well as for Household Decision-Making Index (0.67), and no cut-offs for individual-level indicators have been adopted for use as direct evidence of food consumption or livelihood change included in the IPC Acute Food Insecurity Reference Table. Further efforts are required to assess the usefulness of different indicators for food security -specific gender-based analysis. With continued gender-sensitive analyses and partner collaboration it should be possible to come up with a solid experience base on which to build strong recommendations for data collection.

Another challenge to gender-sensitive analyses is communication, especially lack of standardised communication protocols for conveying the results of gender-sensitive analysis. This is linked to a related problem of understanding better the needs of decision-makers for types of information and communication products to facilitate differentiated responses and programmes. With further gender-sensitive analyses and lessons learning best practices can be identified for communication purposes. Mapping protocols for analysis of household groups remain an outstanding question that will require in-depth discussions with the IPC partners.

Communication is further hampered by lack of up-to-date information on population size. In case of gender-sensitive HAG analysis, it is difficult to provide population estimates in absence of information on the share of female – and male-headed households out of the total population in a given analysis area. Recent survey data can be, and has been used as a proxy, but a discussion is needed within the TWG in each country conducting gender-sensitive HAG analysis in order to find the best possible solution for the country in question.

Finally, the technical capacity of analysts to conduct gender-based analysis is typically limited, given the lack of attention to gender issues over the past years of IPC implementation. This knowledge and skill gap can only be addressed through further capacity building, sharing of cross-country experiences, and by involving a critical mass of analysts in gender-sensitive and other types of disaggregated analyses.

¹¹ The results of the study on decision-makers' needs for disaggregated IPC analysis are expected to inform further development of protocols and guidance for disaggregated analysis, including gender-sensitive IPC analysis.

ANNEX 3:

Resource Materials on Gender Aspects

[Food Security and Gender Equality](#): A synergistic understudied symphony. CARE, July 2022.

More information on inclusion of gender considerations in data collection and analysis is provided e.g. in guidelines provided by WFP: [Thematic Guidelines. Integrating a Gender Perspective into Vulnerability Analysis](#). WFP, March 2005.

UN gender indicators are available at [UN Statistics Division –website](#)

United Nations [Disability Statistics Programme](#)

United Nations [Gender Statistics](#), including World's Women –reports and statistics:

Information on Household Decision-Making Index, including the questionnaire module and instruction for analysis are available [here](#).

For more information about the GE4FS, see a ReliefWeb report on the indicator and findings from analyses in 17 countries [here](#)

The Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index (WEAI) tool is available [here](#). More information on the tool and reports on findings are available on the [IFPRI site on WEAI](#).

The Women's Empowerment in Livestock Index (WELI) tool is available [here](#). More information on this tool developed by ILRI (International Livestock Research Institute) is available [here](#).

Qualitative Research Methods: A Data Collector's Field Guide by Family Health International 360 is available [here](#).